

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-14, 16-26, 28-31, 33-36 and 38-42 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 17, 21, 26, 34 and 38 and 39 have been amended as shown on pages 2-9 of the Reply. New claims 41 and 42 have been added.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Lay for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on March 21, 2007. It was submitted to the Examiner that a print preview with a thumbnail of the current web page is not taught by either of the references. It was agreed that the argument overcomes the rejections. It was also requested that since the limitations were already presented in examined claim 26, the next office action with any further rejections be non-final.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 4-9, 12-14, 16-25 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 4-9, 12-14, 16-25 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* (US 6,920,609 B1) over in view of Cudd *et al.* (US 2004/0105127 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Manber *et al.* nor Cudd *et al.*, teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicants' disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants' claimed invention discloses a system and method to facilitate online printing of web pages by employing smart techniques to allow a user to obtain a formatted version of

desired content. In particular, amended independent claim 1 recites *a preview component that visualizes a preview version of a printable page for a web user, disposes a thumbnail reference of the at least one current web page on a portion of the generated print preview version and allows the web user to modify the preview version according to user preferences.* Independent claims 17, 21 and 38 recite similar limitations. Manber *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these novel aspects of applicants' claimed invention.

Manber *et al.* teaches a system and method for analyzing the structure of a web page in HTML or other markup language, automatically identifying and extracting desired information, and populating a database. As conceded by the Examiner on page 11 of the subject Office Action, Manber *et al.* does not teach or suggest a preview component that visualizes a print preview version.

Cudd *et al.* relates to a method of forming a printable representation of web pages. The method includes dynamically adjusting the scale and height of individual frames contained on a web page so that the layout of the web page, as presented on the display screen does not exceed the print media upon which the page is printed. The entire content of the original web page is formatted, shown for preview and then printed. However, Cudd *et al.* is silent regarding *a preview component that disposes a thumbnail reference of the at least one current web page on a portion of the generated print preview version and allows the web user to modify the preview version* as recited by the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Manber *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the applicants' subject claims. Accordingly it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 10, 11, 39 and 40 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 10, 11, 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Manber *et al.* over in view of Cudd *et al.* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Meyerzon *et al* (U.S. 6,638,314). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Manber *et al.*, Cudd *et al.* and Meyerzon *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

The subject claims respectively depend from amended independent claims 1 and 39.

Claim 39 recites similar limitations as claim 1. In particular, as discussed *supra*, Manber *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* are silent with respect to the claimed limitation of ***disposes a thumbnail reference of the at least one current web page on a portion of the generated print preview version.*** Meyerzon *et al.* fails to overcome these deficiencies of Manber *et al.* and Cudd *et al.*

Meyerzon *et al.* relates to a computer based system and method of retrieving data from a computer network. A web crawl is performed by retrieving a set of electronic documents and subsequently retrieving additional electronic documents, based on addresses specified within each electronic document. The cited reference is silent regarding generating a print preview and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Manber *et al* and Cudd *et al.* Therefore, applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 26, 28-31 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 26, 28-31 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* in view of Cudd *et al.*, as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Office 2000. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Manber *et al.*, Cudd *et al.* and Office 2000, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

The subject claims respectively depend from amended independent claim 26. In particular, Manber *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* are silent with respect to the claimed limitation of ***disposes a thumbnail reference of the at least one current web page on a portion of the generated print preview version.*** Office 2000 fails to overcome these deficiencies of Manber *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* On page 11 of the subject Office Action, it is erroneously contended that Office 2000 teaches these novel aspects. Although a current view in Power point comprises a thumbnail of a slide, a print preview of the current view would not comprise such a thumbnail. In accordance with the subject claims, the print preview component facilitates editing the generated print preview. Hence, disposing a thumbnail of the current web page on the print preview mitigates the need for a user to switch context from the print preview to the current view in order to determine the sections to be edited. Such novel aspects are not taught or suggested by any of the cited references. Therefore, applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 34-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cudd, *et al.* in view of Office 2000. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Cudd *et al.* and Office 2000, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

The subject claims respectively depend from amended independent claim 34 that recites *a component to generate the print preview page, the print preview page further comprises at least a subset of content parsed from a web page; and at least a thumbnail reference of the at least one current web page prior to being parsed and optionally a summary of the web page.* As discussed *supra*, Cudd *et al.* is silent with respect to the claimed limitation. Office 2000 fails to overcome these deficiencies of Cudd *et al.* Therefore, applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP513US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731